

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
NORTHERN DIVISION

JOHN UMBARGER #251202,

Petitioner,

v.

Case No. 2:07-cv-192
HON. ROBERT HOLMES BELL

GERALD HOFBAUER,

Respondent.

_____ /

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Petitioner John Umbarger filed this petition for writ of habeas corpus, challenging a March 10, 2005, major misconduct conviction for possession of stolen property. Petitioner states that on April 28, 2006, the warden sentenced him to the loss of 15 days of disciplinary credits. On February 12, 2007, Petitioner filed a motion for relief from judgment, which was rejected on February 13, 2007, on the basis that Petitioner had mistaken an administrative procedure for a criminal conviction and that a motion for relief from judgment was not the proper avenue for relief. Petitioner's subsequent motion for reconsideration was denied for the same reason on February 21, 2007.

Petitioner filed an appeal in the Michigan Court of Appeals on March 9, 2007. On April 12, 2007, Petitioner's action was classified as civil and he was required to pay a filing fee of \$375.00, or a partial filing fee of \$69.00. Petitioner states that because he could not afford the \$375.00 filing fee, and the partial fee would not eliminate his financial obligation for the remainder of the fee, he was barred from proceeding in the Michigan Court of Appeals. Petitioner then filed an application for leave to appeal in the Michigan Supreme Court on April 25, 2007. On May 10,

2007, the Michigan Supreme Court classified Petitioner's action as civil and required him to pay the \$375.00 filing fee. Petitioner states that because he was unable to pay the filing fee, he was barred from proceeding in the Michigan Supreme Court.

Upon a review of the petition, it appears to the undersigned that Petitioner is barred from proceeding in this action by the doctrine of procedural default. Therefore, in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), authorizing United States Magistrate Judges to submit proposed findings of fact and recommendations for disposition of prisoner petitions, I recommend that the petition be dismissed.

Before the court may grant habeas relief to a state prisoner, the prisoner must exhaust remedies available in the state courts. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b)(1); *O'Sullivan v. Boerckel*, 526 U.S. 838, 842 (1999). Exhaustion requires a petitioner to "fairly present" federal claims so that state courts have a "fair opportunity" to apply controlling legal principles to the facts bearing upon a petitioner's constitutional claim. *See O'Sullivan*, 526 U.S. at 842; *Picard v. Connor*, 404 U.S. 270, 275-77 (1971) (cited by *Duncan v. Henry*, 513 U.S. 364, 365 (1995) and *Anderson v. Harless*, 459 U.S. 4, 6 (1982)). To fulfill the exhaustion requirement, a petitioner must have fairly presented his federal claims to all levels of the state appellate system, including the state's highest court. *Duncan*, 513 U.S. at 365-66; *Silverburg v. Evitts*, 993 F.2d 124, 126 (6th Cir. 1993); *Hafley v. Sowders*, 902 F.2d 480, 483 (6th Cir. 1990). "[S]tate prisoners must give the state courts one full opportunity to resolve any constitutional issues by invoking one complete round of the State's established appellate review process." *O'Sullivan*, 526 U.S. at 845.

When a state-law default prevents further state consideration of a federal issue, the federal courts are ordinarily precluded from considering that issue on habeas corpus review. *See Ylst v. Nunemaker*, 501 U.S. 797, 801 (1991); *Engle v. Isaac*, 456 U.S. 107 (1982). The Sixth Circuit

applies a four-part test to determine whether a claim is procedurally defaulted: (1) the court must first determine that there is a state procedural rule that is applicable to the petitioner's claim and that the petitioner failed to comply with the rule; (2) the court must decide whether the state courts actually enforced the state procedural rule; (3) the default must be an "independent and adequate" state ground on which the state can rely to foreclose review of a federal constitutional claim; and (4) if the foregoing are met, the petitioner must demonstrate cause for his failure to follow the rule and that he was actually prejudiced by the alleged constitutional error. *Buell v. Mitchell*, 274 F.3d 337, 348 (6th Cir. 2001) (citing *Maupin v. Smith*, 785 F.2d 135, 138 (6th Cir. 1986); accord *Greer v. Mitchell*, 264 F.3d 663, 672 (6th Cir. 2001). There may be an "exceptional case in which exorbitant application of a generally sound rule renders the state ground inadequate to stop consideration of a federal question." *Lee v. Kemna*, 122 S.Ct. 877, 878 (2002). A petitioner may also excuse a default by making a colorable claim of innocence; that is, he has shown that any constitutional error "probably" resulted in the conviction of one who was actually innocent. *Schlup v. Delo*, 513 U.S. 298, 322 (1995) (citing *Murray v. Carrier*, 477 U.S. 478, 495 (1986)). This exception is reserved for a very narrow class of cases, based on a claim of "new reliable evidence." *Schlup*, 513 U.S. at 315, 324.

When a petitioner has procedurally defaulted in the state courts, the federal habeas court will only entertain the defaulted issue if the petitioner can show "cause" for the procedural default and "actual prejudice" as result of the alleged federal violation or can show actual innocence. *Coleman*, 501 U.S. at 750 (1991); *Murray*, 477 U.S. at 485; *Lucas v. O'Dea*, 169 F.3d 1028, 1033 (6th Cir. 1999); *Rust*, 17 F.3d at 160-61. To show cause sufficient to excuse a failure to raise claims on direct appeal, petitioner must point to "some objective factor external to the defense" that

prevented him from raising the issue in his first appeal. *Murray*, 477 U.S. at 488; *see McCleskey v. Zant*, 499 U.S. 467, 497 (1991).

Under MDOC policy and state law, Petitioner's remedies included a request for rehearing and then a series of discretionary appeals in the state courts. See M.C.L. 791.254, et seq.; M.S.A. 28.2320(54), et seq.; Michigan Ad. Rule R 791.3320; MDOC Policy Directive 03.03.105(X)-(AA) (Eff. 1/1/99). As noted above, Petitioner did not file a request for rehearing. Rather, he mistakenly filed a motion for relief from judgment. Petitioner has not attempted to explain his failure to file a request for rehearing in a timely manner in the state courts. Because a request for a rehearing must be filed within 30 days after the final decision or order is issued after the initial hearing, Petitioner may no longer file such a motion. Where a petitioner fails to show cause, the court need not consider whether he has established prejudice. *See Engle*, 456 U.S. at 134 n.43; *Leroy v. Marshall*, 757 F.2d 94, 100 (6th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 474 U.S. 831 (1985). Accordingly, because Petitioner's claim is procedurally barred, his application for habeas review should be denied.

In summary, the undersigned concludes that Petitioner's claims are barred by the doctrine of procedural default and therefore recommends that this Court dismiss the petition with prejudice.

In addition, if Petitioner should choose to appeal this action, I recommend that a certificate of appealability be denied as to each issue raised by Petitioner in this application for habeas corpus relief. Under 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2), the court must determine whether a certificate of appealability should be granted. A certificate should issue if Petitioner has demonstrated a "substantial showing of a denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). A dismissal of Petitioner's action under Rule 4 of the Rules Governing § 2254 Cases is a determination that the habeas action, on its face, lacks sufficient merit to warrant service. It would be highly unlikely for

this court to grant a certificate, thus indicating to the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals that an issue merits review, if the court has already determined that the action is so lacking in merit that service is not warranted. *See Love v. Butler*, 952 F.2d 10 (1st Cir. 1991) (it is “somewhat anomalous” for the court to summarily dismiss under Rule 4 and grant a certificate); *Hendricks v. Vasquez*, 908 F.2d 490 (9th Cir. 1990) (requiring reversal where court summarily dismissed under Rule 4 but granted certificate); *Dory v. Commissioner of Correction of the State of New York*, 865 F.2d 44, 46 (2d Cir. 1989) (it was “intrinsically contradictory” to grant a certificate when habeas action does not warrant service under Rule 4); *Williams v. Kullman*, 722 F.2d 1048, 1050 n.1 (2d Cir. 1983) (issuing certificate would be inconsistent with a summary dismissal).

The Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals has disapproved issuance of blanket denials of a certificate of appealability. *Murphy v. Ohio*, 263 F.3d 466 (6th Cir. Aug. 27, 2001). Rather, the district court must “engage in a reasoned assessment of each claim” to determine whether a certificate is warranted. *Id.* Each issue must be considered under the standards set forth by the Supreme Court in *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473 (2000). *Murphy v. Ohio*, 263 F.3d 466 (6th Cir. Aug. 27, 2001). Consequently, the undersigned has examined each of Petitioner’s claims under the *Slack* standard.

The undersigned recommends that the court deny Petitioner’s application on procedural grounds that it is barred by the doctrine of procedural default. Under *Slack*, 529 U.S. at 484, when a habeas petition is denied on procedural grounds, a certificate of appealability may issue only “when the prisoner shows, at least, [1] that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right and [2] that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling.” Both showings must be made to warrant the grant of a certificate. *Id.* The undersigned concludes that reasonable jurists

could not debate that each of Petitioner's claims are properly dismissed on the procedural grounds that it is barred by the doctrine of procedural default. "Where a plain procedural bar is present and the district court is correct to invoke it to dispose of the case, a reasonable jurist could not conclude either that the district court erred in dismissing the petition or that the petitioner should be allowed to proceed further." *Id.* Therefore, the undersigned recommends that the court deny Petitioner a certificate of appealability.

NOTICE TO PARTIES: Objections to this Report and Recommendation must be served on opposing parties and filed with the Clerk of the Court within ten (10) days of receipt of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); W.D. Mich. LCivR 72.3(b). Failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of any further right to appeal. *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981). *See also Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985).

/s/ Timothy P. Greeley

TIMOTHY P. GREELEY

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Dated: November 9, 2007